



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,175	01/16/2002	Yoshiaki Watanabe	0879-0369P	2336

2292 7590 11/29/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/046,175	Applicant(s) WATANABE, YOSHIAKI	
Examiner Ryan F. Pitaro	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This action is in response the Amendment D filed September 15,2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,22,28,29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343).

As per independent claim 1, Sobeski discloses client/server system comprising a plurality of computers connected to a network, wherein: a server on the network possesses button information which is data on menu buttons operating in connection

Art Unit: 2174

with a client application introduced into a client computer wherein the server generates customized updated button information and wherein the server has a function of transmitting the customized updated button information to the client computer (Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18); and the client application comprises a program which causes the client computer to provide a function of communicating with the server to obtain the customized updated button information from the server (Column 5 line 36 – Column 6 line 18), a function of displaying menu buttons on a display in combination with a GUI screen of the client application according to the customized updated button information obtained (Column 5 lines 64-66, and a function of performing operations defined for the displayed menu buttons (Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18; Column 10 line 13-25).

Claim 22 is similar in scope to that of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, Sobeski teaches an apparatus connected to a network, comprising: a memory storing a set of instructions; and a processor to execute the stored set of instructions to perform a method comprising: accessing a server on the network (Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18); obtaining button information from the server (Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18); displaying menu buttons on a display based on the obtained button information (Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18),

Art Unit: 2174

wherein the menu buttons are associated with pre-defined operations to be performed at the apparatus (Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18).

As per claim 29, Sobeski teaches an apparatus connected to a network, comprising; a memory for storing button information representing data on menu buttons for operation with an application executed on a client computer and a set of instructions; a processor to execute the stored set of instructions to perform a method comprising: receiving a request for button information to the client computer in response to the request (Column 5 line 64 – Column 6 line 18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) in view of Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski teaches the client application transmits an update request to the server, and in response to the update request the server provides the customized updated button information to the client

Art Unit: 2174

application (Column 10 lines 13-25). However, Sobeski does not expressly disclose an actual update button. Reha does teach a GUI screen of the client application has an update button operated by a user to instruct the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 7 lines 21-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Reha with the system of Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a simple way of letting the users of Sobeski to update the menu and button information when requesting to do so.

5. Claims 11,17,21,23,25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709) in view of Shima et al ("Shima", US 6,295,479).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski-Reha teach menu and button updates but fail to expressly teach the specifics of the button parameters. However, Shima teaches a system wherein the button information includes button IDs as unique identification codes defined for the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 22-34), condition flags used to determine whether the menu buttons are enabled or disabled (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56), action types which are condition flags used to determine operation of the menu buttons, and information used to identify images of the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the parameters of Shima with the

modified system of Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to establish a common list of parameters, which distinctly define the buttons from each other.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 11, Sobeski-Reha-Shima teaches the GUI screen of the client application has an update button operated by a user to instruct the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 7 lines 21-27); and when the update button is operated, the client application transmits an update request to the server, and in response to the update request the server provides the customized updated button information to the client application (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13 –25).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 11, Sobeski-Reha-Shima teaches a system wherein the server transmits list information on button IDs of new menu buttons to be incorporated based on the customized updated button information to the client application which has requested the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-43), to the client application which has requested the current menu buttons to be updated (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25); upon receiving the list information on button IDs, the client application compares the button IDs described in the list information with the button IDs in the button information saved in a storage device of the client computer, and requests the server to obtain the button information on the button IDs described in the list information only if these button IDs are different from the button IDs in the button information (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65); and the server transmits the customized updated button information on the requested button IDs to the client

Art Unit: 2174

application (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18; Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65;).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 22, Sobeski-Reha-Shima teaches a system wherein the button information includes button IDs as unique identification codes defined for the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 22-34), condition flags used to determine whether the menu buttons are enabled or disabled (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56), action types which are condition flags used to determine operation of the menu buttons, and information used to identify images of the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56); the server transmits, to the client application which has requested the menu buttons to be updated (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18), list information on button IDs of new menu buttons to be incorporated based on the customized updated button (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-43), to the client application which has requested the current menu buttons to be updated (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25); upon receiving the list information on button IDs, the client application compares the button IDs described in the list information with the button IDs in the button information saved in a storage device of the client computer, and requests the server to obtain the button information on the button IDs described in the list information only if these button IDs are different from the button IDs in the button information (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65); and the server transmits the button information on the requested button IDs to the client application (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18; Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65).

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 24, Sobeski-Reha-Shima teaches a system wherein the button information includes button IDs as unique identification codes defined for the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 22-34), condition flags used to determine whether the menu buttons are enabled or disabled (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56), action types which are condition flags used to determine operation of the menu buttons, and information used to identify images of the menu buttons (Shima, Column 14 lines 35-56); the server transmits, to the client application which has requested the menu buttons to be updated (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18), list information on button IDs of new menu buttons to be incorporated based on the customized updated button (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-43) , to the client application, which has requested the current menu buttons to be updated (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25) ; upon receiving the list information on button IDs, the client application compares the button IDs described in the list information with the button IDs in the button information saved in a storage device of the client computer, and requests the server to obtain the customized updated button information on the button IDs described in the list information only if these button IDs are different from the button IDs in the button information (Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65); and the server transmits the button information on the requested button IDs to the client application (Sobeski, Column 5 line 35 – Column 6 line 18; Reha, Column 9 lines 33-65).

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski-Reha-Shima discloses the system wherein the server automatically determines the customized updated button information to send to the client application (Reha, Column 9 lines 52-65).

Claim 27 is similar in scope to that of claim 26, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) in view of Manolis et al ("Manolis", US 6,583,799).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski fails to disclose the application comprising an image viewer with a browsing function. However, Manolis teaches a system wherein: the client application comprises an image viewer which causes the client computer to provide an image transmitting and receiving function and an image browsing function (Figure 9); and the menu buttons are image transmitting GUI buttons for which a destination of an image is set (Figure 9; *upload and browse*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of Sobeski with the teaching of Manolis. Motivation to do so would have been a design choice since the environment of the menu does not affect the functionality of the personalized interface.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709) and Shima et al

Art Unit: 2174

("Shima", US 6,295,479) and Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829) in view of Manolis et al ("Manolis", US 6,583,799).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, Sobeski-Reha-Shima-Brennan fails to disclose the application comprising an image viewer with a browsing function. However, Manolis teaches a system wherein: the client application comprises an image viewer which causes the client computer to provide an image transmitting and receiving function and an image browsing function (Figure 9); and the menu buttons are image transmitting GUI buttons for which a destination of an image is set (Figure 9; *upload and browse*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of Sobeski-Reha-Shima-Brennan with the teaching of Manolis. Motivation to do so would have been a design choice since the environment of the menu does not affect the functionality of the personalized interface.

8. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709) and Shima et al ("Shima", US 6,295,479) in view of Manolis et al ("Manolis", US 6,583,799).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 11, Sobeski-Reha-Shima fails to disclose the application comprising an image viewer with a browsing function. However,

Art Unit: 2174

Manolis teaches a system wherein: the client application comprises an image viewer which causes the client computer to provide an image transmitting and receiving function and an image browsing function (Figure 9); and the menu buttons are image transmitting GUI buttons for which a destination of an image is set (Figure 9; *upload and browse*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of Sobeski-Reha-Shima with the teaching of Manolis. Motivation to do so would have been a design choice since the environment of the menu does not affect the functionality of the personalized interface.

9. Claims 4,5,6,9,10,24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) in view of Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski teaches a personalization system, but does not distinctly point out specifically storing and distributing the information. However, Brennan discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server ([0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button determining device which determines contents of the customized updated button

information to be distributed to the users on the basis of the users' personal information ([0034] lines 13-14); and the button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application ([0033] lines 24-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the interface personalization system of Brennan with the system of Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to tailor an interface to a user so that unwanted elements are not included making the interface simpler.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Sobeski-Brennan discloses a system wherein: the personal information on the users is registered in the database using an online user registering function of the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6); upon registration, each user is provided with a user ID which is a unique identification code (Brennan, Figure 3; *access number*); and subsequent requests from the client application to the server are provided with the user ID so as to authenticate the user ID (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6; *authentication procedure*).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Sobeski-Brennan discloses a system wherein: an effective start date and time and an effective end date and time are set as parameters for the customized updated button information (Brennan, [0029] lines 1-5); and the client application provides a function of displaying the menu buttons only during this period (Brennan, [0029] lines 1-5).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 6, Sobeski-Brennan discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server (Brennan, [0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button determining device which determines contents of the customized updated button information to be distributed to the users on the basis of the users' personal information (Brennan, [0034] lines 13-14); and the customized updated button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 24-28).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Sobeski-Brennan discloses a system wherein: the personal information on the users is registered in the database using an online user registering function of the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6); upon registration, each user is provided with a user ID which is a unique identification code (Brennan, Figure 3; *access number*); and subsequent requests from the client application to the server are provided with the user ID so as to authenticate the user ID (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6; *authentication procedure*).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 22, Sobeski teaches a personalization system, but does not distinctly point out specifically storing and distributing the information. However, Brennan discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server ([0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button

Art Unit: 2174

determining device which generates the customized updated button information to be distributed to the users on the basis of the users' personal information ([0034] lines 13-14); and the customized updated button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application ([0033] lines 24-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the interface personalization system of Brennan with the system of Sobeski. Motivation to do so would have been to tailor an interface to a user so that unwanted elements are not included making the interface simpler.

10. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) in view of Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829) in view of Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Sobeski-Brennan teaches the client application transmits an update request to the server, and in response to the update request the server provides the button information to the client application (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25). However, Sobeski-Brennan does not expressly

Art Unit: 2174

disclose an actual update button. Reha does teach a GUI screen of the client application has an update button operated by a user to instruct the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 7 lines 21-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Reha with the system of Sobeski-Brennan. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a simple way of letting the users of Sobeski to update the menu and button information when requesting to do so.

11. Claims 12,13,15,16,19,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Reha et al ("Reha", US 6,282,709) and Shima et al ("Shima", US 6,295,479) in view of Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, Sobeski-Reha-Shima fails to disclose an effective end and start time. However, Brennan discloses a system wherein: an effective start date and time and an effective end date and time are set as parameters for the customized updated button information (Brennan, [0029] lines 1-5); and the client application provides a function of displaying the menu buttons only during this period (Brennan, [0029] lines 1-5). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the interface personalization system of

Art Unit: 2174

Brennan with the system of Sobeski-Reha-Shima. Motivation to do so would have been to tailor an interface to a user so that unwanted elements are not included, making the interface simpler.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, Sobeski-Reha-Shima-Brennan teaches the GUI screen of the client application has an update button operated by a user to instruct the menu buttons to be updated (Reha, Column 7 lines 21-27); and when the update button is operated, the client application transmits an update request to the server, and in response to the update request the server provides the customized updated button information to the client application (Sobeski, Column 10 lines 13-25).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 12, Sobeski-Reha-Shima-Brennan discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server (Brennan, [0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button determining device which determines contents of the customized updated button information to be distributed to the users on the basis of the users' personal information (Brennan, [0034] lines 13-14); and the customized updated button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 24-28).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Sobeski-Reha-Shima-Brennan discloses a system wherein: the personal information on the users is registered in the database using an online user registering function of the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6); upon registration, each user is provided with a user ID which is a unique identification code (Brennan, Figure 3; *access number*); and subsequent requests from the client application to the server are provided with the user ID so as to authenticate the user ID (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6; *authentication procedure*).

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 11, Sobeski-Reha-Shima teaches a personalization system, but does not distinctly point out specifically storing and distributing the information. However, Brennan discloses a system wherein: the server comprises: a database which stores personal information on users who activate the client application to access the server ([0033] lines 6-11); and a distribution button determining device which determines contents of the menu buttons to be distributed to the users on the basis of the users' personal information ([0034] lines 13-14); and the button information on the menu buttons determined by the distribution button determining device is delivered to the client application ([0033] lines 24-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the interface personalization system of Brennan with the system of Sobeski-Reha-Shima. Motivation to do so would have been to tailor an interface to a user so that unwanted elements are not included making the interface simpler.

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, Sobeski-Reha-Shima-Brennan discloses a system wherein: the personal information on the users is registered in the database using an online user registering function of the client application (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6); upon registration, each user is provided with a user ID which is a unique identification code (Brennan, Figure 3; *access number*); and subsequent requests from the client application to the server are provided with the user ID so as to authenticate the user ID (Brennan, [0033] lines 4-6; *authentication procedure*).

12. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski et al ("Sobeski", US 6,819,343) and Brennan et al ("Brennan", US 2002/0077829) in view of Manolis et al ("Manolis", US 6,583,799).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 6, Sobeski-Brennan fails to disclose the application comprising an image viewer with a browsing function. However, Manolis teaches a system wherein: the client application comprises an image viewer which causes the client computer to provide an image transmitting and receiving function and an image browsing function (Figure 9); and the menu buttons are image transmitting GUI buttons for which a destination of an image is set (Figure 9; *upload and browse*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to

Art Unit: 2174

combine the system of Sobeski-Brennan with the teaching of Manolis. Motivation to do so would have been a design choice since the environment of the menu does not affect the functionality of the personalized interface.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/15/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Sobeski fails to teach or suggest a server storing button information and the server generating customized button information as claimed. However, Sobeski clearly teaches as pointed out by the Applicant at Column 5 lines 36-49. Sobeski reads in the first few lines the toolbar does^{KK} not receive the (customized button information) from the web browser but rather from a cooperating server. Sobeski does state that a user **may** update parameters to reflect changes (emphasis added), but even if the user were to invoke the changes it is still the server which would do the actually updating. It would be the user's job to request this information similar to that stated in claim 2 of the present application.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday through Thursday and on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100